



Michael B. Wittig
355 Mariposa Avenue #5
Mountain View, CA 94041

December 13, 2002

VIA EXPRESS MAIL

Mr. Hanh N. Nguyen
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

Re: Application 09/770,939

#13
Response Extension
J.Wittig
J-705
RECEIVED
DEC 19 2002
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

Dear Mr Nguyen:

This letter is a response to the office action on the above Patent Application.

Drawing and Specification Rejections:

I have corrected the drawings according to section 1 of the office action, with the exception of the subject of paragraph 2 of that section. Figure 3 shows a plurality of rotor components 130, numbered identically to clearly indicate their identical nature. Paragraph 0046 of the specification explains that Figure 4 shows one the rotor components, and it is clear that the other rotor components have the same structure from the labeling of Figure 3. The language of the claims, "first and second electrical conductors secured to the first and second rotor components respectively" refers to conductor 140, as shown in Figures 4 and 5, on each of two identical rotor components, as each rotor component is structured as shown in Figure 3.

I have corrected the specification as requested in section 2 of the office action. I have included the revised pages.

Claim Rejections, 35 USC 112

Claim 10 is referring to the statements made near the end of the specification, in paragraph 0060, which states: "Furthermore, the present invention utilizes electromagnets because of better performance. Permanent magnets could alternatively be used to reduce cost and/or power consumption." Thus, the subject material was included in the specification.

Claims 1 and 12 are referring to the structure of Figure 3, wherein multiple rotor components 130 are each occupying their own gap 122.

Claim Rejections, 35 USC 102 & 103

An important difference between the Goldie et al patent and the material of this application is the fact that Goldie's design either 1) incorporates magnetic teeth or 2) is an induction device. Fig 2. of Goldie et al shows the magnetic teeth version and Fig 4 demonstrates the induction version. It is important to note that the device of Application 09/770,939 is not an induction device. Next, it

12/13/2002 09300020 09770939
450.00 CP
C-70-2800



Michael B. Wittig
355 Mariposa Avenue #5
Mountain View, CA 94041

December 13, 2002
Page 2

must be understood that the device of Application 09/770,939 does not contain magnetic teeth, as does the invention disclosed in Goldie et al. Because of the lack of magnetic teeth, the motor of Application 09/770,939 does not have "cogging torque" which is present in the Goldie device when built as a non-induction machine. Second, the motor of Application 09/770,939 does not experience losses associated with eddie current development within magnetic teeth as does the Goldie device. I believe the understanding of these key differences will resolve the rejection under Sections 102 and 103.

Sincerely,

Michael Wittig

RECEIVED
DEC 19 2002
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

/Enclosures